



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,271	02/17/2004	Bjoern Goerke	09700.0066-01	2046
22852 7590 07/05/2007 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			EXAMINER STEVENS, ROBERT	
			ART UNIT 2162	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/05/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/781,271

Applicant(s)

GOERKE ET AL.

Examiner

Robert Stevens

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-24 and 28-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-24 and 28-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Office withdraws the previous rejections of the claims under 35 USC §§101, 112-2nd paragraph and 103(a), in light of the amendment. However, the Office sets forth new rejections of the claims under 35 USC §103(a), in light of the amendment.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The previous rejections of the claims under 35 USC 101 and 112-2nd paragraph have been rendered moot by the amendments. In particular, the claim 28 and 29 recitations now produce a **useful**, concrete and tangible result.

Applicants arguments concerning the previous rejections of the claims under 35 USC 103(a) appear to be directed to the amended claim language. This language was cited as being taught by an additional reference, which was not before the Applicant. Thus the arguments are deemed moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

For at least these reasons, the Office asserts the rejections of the claims as set forth below.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/26/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-3, 5-24 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Inanoria (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0046789, provisionally filed Aug. 23, 2002 and published Mar. 11, 2004, hereafter referred to as "Inanoria") in view of Pena et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0225829, provisionally filed May 22, 2002 and published Dec. 4, 2003, hereafter referred to as "Pena") and Tim Pattison et al. ("Information Visualisation Using Composable Layouts and Visual Sets", Australian Symposium on Information Visualisation, Vol. 9, Sydney, Australia, Dec. 2001, pp. 1-10, hereafter referred to as "Pattison").

Regarding independent claim 1: Inanoria discloses: *A computer program product, tangibly embodied in computer readable medium, the computer program product comprising instructions operable to cause data processing apparatus to assist in development of user interfaces: receiving user input specifying a view composition, the view composition comprising a set of views, each view in the set of views comprising a layout of one or more user interface elements selected from a set of user interface elements, (See paragraphs [0124] – [0126] in the context of [0145] in Inanoria, discussing a Layout Manager using templates for providing GUI layouts, and Figure 8, showing an exemplary layout) and storing the view composition in a repository. (See [0099] in Inanoria, discussing the calling of the appropriate template, having been implied that the template was being called from storage.)*

However, Inanoria does not explicitly disclose navigation links. Pena, though, discloses: *the view composition further comprising a layout of the views and at least one navigation link, each navigation link specifying a potential transition from a first view in the set of views to a second view in the set of views, wherein each navigation link comprises an association between an exit point in the first view and an entry point in the second view; (See paragraph [0095] in the context of [0099] in Pena, discussing the use of a link for action transitions among page views. It is noted that such links inherently associate views.) such that a rendering program uses the view composition to display the user interface. (See Pena Fig. 8 #804, which discusses the rendering of the models)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Pena for the benefit of Inanoria, because to do so allowed a system designer to implement a platform- and language-independent content delivery system and method, as taught by Pena in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of graphical user interfaces.

However, Inanoria does not explicitly disclose the remaining limitations as claimed. Pattison, though, discloses: *enabling a user to lay out one or more views for a user interface*; (See Pattison page 5 Fig. 2 showing a GUI for specifying a view and consists of a layout composition tree on the left and a layout rule customizer on the right, as discussed in the paragraph starting above, and finishing below, Fig. 2. Also note the discussion in the 1st paragraph of the section entitled “1. Introduction” on page 1, of prior art graph visualization and navigation techniques as assisting users in exploring large datasets having inherent relations among data elements, such as web pages and databases.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Pattison for the benefit of Inanoria in view of Pena, because to do so allowed a user to simultaneously exploit the strengths of a number of information visualization techniques, as taught by Pattison in the 3rd paragraph of section “1. Introduction” on page 1. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of graphical user interfaces.

Regarding claim 2: Inanoria teaches multiple user interface elements, view user elements and container elements. (See Figure 3, showing multiple buttons and multiple windows, and paragraph [0075], discussing grouping and nesting of containers.)

Regarding claim 3: Inanoria teaches manipulating property settings. (See paragraph [0065].)

Regarding claim 5: Inanoria does not explicitly teach this limitation as claimed. However, Pena teaches using events to trigger navigation links and event handlers. (See paragraph [0062], discussing IDML Actions processing.)

Regarding claim 6: Inanoria teaches using pre-defined layouts. (See paragraph [0124], discussing master templates and a plurality of templates for each supported layout.)

Regarding claim 7: Inanoria teaches nesting of views. (See paragraphs [0075] – [0076], discussing grouping and nesting of GUI components in a container.)

Regarding claims 8-9: Inanoria teaches view association. (See Figure 8, showing the result of an association of views and view containers in an enclosing view.) Inanoria further teaches the use of pre-defined layouts. (See paragraph [0124].)

Regarding claims 10-11: Inanoria teaches view association. (See Figure 8, showing the result of an association of views and view containers in an enclosing view.) Inanoria further teaches the use of pre-defined layouts. (See paragraph [0124]. The specific view designated as a default was also an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.)

Regarding claims 12-13: Inanoria teaches the use of reusable components. (See paragraph [0011], discussing the use of reusable and extendible content objects. Reuse of software components, including coded classes and objects, was well-known and whether to employ such a strategy was also an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.)

Regarding claim 14: Inanoria teaches the use of user GUI controls. (See Figure 10A – 10D, showing an editor GUI, and Figure 1, noting the client browser transmission of the HTTP request [element #1].)

Regarding claim 15: Inanoria teaches the use and storage of XML view compositions. (See paragraphs [0099] and [0102], discussing the use of XSL templates, which are written in XML, and paragraph [0103] discussing the “importing” of an XSL file, it having been implicit that such a file must have first been stored in order to have been later imported.)

Regarding independent claim 16: Inanoria discloses: *A computer program product, tangibly embodied in an information carrier, the computer program product comprising instructions operable to cause data processing apparatus to assist in execution of an application: generating the user interface comprising the layout, the layout and the set of views being specified in a view composition, each view in the set of views comprising a layout of one or more user interface elements selected from a set of user interface elements;* (See paragraphs [0124] – [0126] in the context of [0145] in Inanoria, discussing a Layout Manager using templates for providing GUI layouts, and Figure 8, showing an exemplary layout).

However, Inanoria does not explicitly disclose navigation links. Pena, though, discloses: *modifying the user interface based on at least one navigation link specified in the view composition, wherein each navigation link associates a first view in the set of views with a second view in the set of views, wherein each navigation link comprises an association between an exit point in the first view and an entry point in the second view.* (See paragraph [0095] in the context of [0099] in Pena, discussing the use of a link for action transitions among page views. It is noted that such links inherently associate views.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Pena for the benefit of Inanoria, because to do so allowed a system designer to implement a platform- and language-independent content delivery system and method, as taught by Pena in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of graphical user interfaces.

However, Inanoria does not explicitly disclose the remaining limitations as claimed. Pattison, though, discloses: *enabling a user to lay out one or more views from a set of views for*

a user interface; (See Pattison page 5 Fig. 2 showing a GUI for specifying a view and consists of a layout composition tree on the left and a layout rule customizer on the right, as discussed in the paragraph starting above, and finishing below, Fig. 2. Also note the discussion in the 1st paragraph of the section entitled “1. Introduction” on page 1, of prior art graph visualization and navigation techniques as assisting users in exploring large datasets having inherent relations among data elements, such as web pages and databases. See also the 2nd paragraph of section “2.6 Visual Sets” on page 4, which discuss visual sets and an exemplary stacking order mechanism to achieve an overlay effect.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Pattison for the benefit of Inanoria in view of Pena, because to do so allowed a user to simultaneously exploit the strengths of a number of information visualization techniques, as taught by Pattison in the 3rd paragraph of section “1. Introduction” on page 1. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of graphical user interfaces.

Regarding claims 17-18: Inanoria teaches the invoking of event handlers. (See paragraph [0176], discussing event processing by the Event Manager and event propagation among containers.) However, Inanoria does not explicitly teach displaying a second view. Pena, though, teaches action transitions between page views. (See paragraph [0095].)

Regarding claim 19: Inanoria teaches nesting of views to effect a layout. (See paragraphs [0075] – [0076], discussing grouping of GUI components in a container.) Inanoria further teaches the displaying of the view, which was specified by the layout. (See paragraph [0077], discussing the processing performed by a Layout Manager. The specific layout implemented was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.)

Regarding claims 20-21: Inanoria teaches nesting of views to effect a layout. (See paragraphs [0075] – [0076], discussing grouping of GUI components in a container.) Inanoria further teaches the displaying of the view, which was specified by the layout. (See paragraph [0077], discussing the processing performed by a Layout Manager.)

Regarding claim 22: Inanoria teaches modifying a view composition. (See paragraphs [0075] and [0077], discussing the use of object oriented programming of containers and affecting the visual attributes of hierarchically structured containers.)

Regarding claim 23: Inanoria does not explicitly teach this limitation as claimed. However, Pena teaches using a navigation link to move among page views. (See paragraph [0095] in the context of [0099], discussing the use of a link for action transitions among page views.)

Regarding claim 24: Inanoria teaches the use of reusable components. (See paragraph [0011], discussing the use of reusable and extendible content objects. Reuse of software components, including coded classes and objects, was well-known and whether to employ such a strategy, and the number of reusable components used, was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.)

Independent claims 28-29 are respectively directed to a method and an apparatus for implementing computer product claim 1. As such, these claims are substantially similar to claim 1, and therefore likewise rejected. Pena further discloses the use of a processor in Fig. 2 #220.

Independent claims 30-31 are respectively directed to a method and an apparatus for implementing computer product claim 16. As such, these claims are substantially similar to claim 16, and therefore likewise rejected. Pena further discloses the use of a processor in Fig. 2 #220.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Non-Patent Literature

Pattison, Tim, et al., "View Coordination Architecture For Information Visualisation", Australian Symposium on Information Visualisation, Vol. 9, Sydney, Australia, Dec. 2001, pp. 165-169.

Chen, Lin, et al., "Component-Centric Approach In A Web-Based Home Schooling Application", SAC 2001, Las Vegas, NV, © 2001, pp. 89-93.

Turau, Volker, "A Framework For Automatic Generation of Web-Based Data Entry Applications Based on XML", SAC 2002, Madrid, Spain, © 2002, pp. 1121-1126.

Haruna, Shuusuke, et al., "A GUI Software Development System For Digital AV Applications", Systems and Computers in Japan, Vol. 34, Issue 7, Apr. 22, 2003, pp. 99-107.

US Patent Application Publications

Bach et al	2003/0229646
------------	--------------

US Patents


Fizsman et al	6,115,646
Kekic et al	6,272,537
Flores et al	5,734,837

Contact Information


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Robert Stevens
Examiner
Art Unit 2162

June 19, 2007


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER